***William Henshall***

***First Judicial District***

***P. O. Box 281676***

***San Francisco, California united States***

999-999-9999//youwinincourt@gmail.com

To: Your ***‘Perps’***

 ***Betty Boop-a-Doop -- Office of your STATE Controller***

In Re: ***Petition for Redress of Grievance***

This is a ‘courtesy’ letter pursuant to the invocation of at least the ***Right*** to ***Petition for Redress of Grievance***, in an attempt to come to a ***mutually agreeable*** settlement pursuant to any and all claims of ***Mr. Joe Sixpack*** arising in ***Case No***. ***999999999*** in the your county superior ‘court’, in which ***UNOPPOSED*** record of ***800*** (!) pages of pleadings established, or ***WOULD*** have established ***IF*** there was any right to ***EFFECTIVE*** assistance of counsel, or ‘timely’ challenges to jurisdiction had been ***FILED***, that the trial ‘court’ acted ***coram non judice*** from ***day one***, with the record establishing that ***Petitioner Sixpack*** was ***unlawfully deprived of Rights secured by ALL 6 Articles of the Constitution for the united States {1787-1791} (CuS)*** and which would establish, in any ensuing action, likely ***NOT*** in the Court you would expect, was a ***pernicious, pervasive pattern and practice of pre-meditated criminal***, if not ***Treasonous***, violation of ***Rights*** secured by ***ALL 6 Articles of CuS***  by ***all*** ‘official’ actors in offices of “honor, profit and trust” in the de facto government, which include the local DA ***purportedly neutral*** trial ‘judge’ ***Horatio Curmudgeon Frump, and defense (??) Counsel Hamilton Burger, to name a few and with*** others to be named later, if necessary.

Well worthy of note at the outset is the recent stunning decision of the US supreme Court in ***Ohio v OSHA***, in which the Court acted, for the first time in, ***VERY*** arguably, ***90 years***, as the ***Article III judicial Court*** it was ordained and established to be, most particularly the ***“concurring”*** opinion of Justices ***Gorsuch, Thomas and Alito*** (***Exhibit A***, annotated copy accompanying), which addressed the ***LIMITS*** (!) of the commerce clause powers of ***CON***gress, which are not only ***intimately*** involved in almost ***ALL*** cases today, but ***essential*** to the ***purported*** jurisdiction of the trial ‘court’ /aka/ ***administrative tribunal,*** in the instant case.

This, in concert with either the failure of the trial ‘court’ to ***FILE*** documents and/or ***NON***-existence of the ***Right*** to ***EFFECTIVE*** assistance of counsel, the ‘dissenting’ opinion of ***Justices Alito and Thomas*** in ***Texas v California Case No. 153 Original*** jurisdiction, in which ***FILING*** documents was denied, when ***Article III, Sec. 2 of the CuS*** provides that “in ***ALL*** cases in which a State shall be a party, the supreme Court has ***original*** jurisdiction, that this was not then, nor is it now, only us saying this, since the opinion ***clearly*** and ***unambiguously*** recited ***exactly*** the same language used by Counsel to the contrary of the denial, from Chief Justice John Marshall in ***Cohens v Virginia 6 Wheat. 264***.

And the discussion of, in effect, how “***ALL***” in ***Article III, Section 2*** somehow does ***NOT*** mean ***ALL***, seems to admit of only 2 possibilities, either or both of which ***ADD*** more substance to our positions, as ‘timely’ set forth in our ***UNOPPOSED*** pleadings: 1) that the US supreme Court has somehow ***usurped*** the power to amend the ***CuS***, heretofore thought to have been vested ***solely*** in ***Article V*** thereof, and/or 2) that there ***are*** in fact ***NO*** States remaining which ***were*** admitted into “***this Union***”, again ***seemingly*** without any ***KNOWN*** authority, but in all likelihood yet another ***fatuous fiction of law*** which was ***carefully concealed*** from ***ALL*** who ‘ratified’ the ***NON***-existent 14th ***war*** “amendment” (***NEFWA)***, except the ***NY Bank$ter$*** and their ***sycophantic, serpentine, sphincteresque satraps*** /aka/ members of the ***Secret Committee of 15 on Reconstruction***, which provides a ***very*** ‘plausible’ explanation for the actions of the Court in this area, including denying another attempt by Texas, and other States to even ***FILE*** documents in the recent “election” case, let alone hear the case, in that ***WITHOUT*** any States remaining, there ***seems*** to be ***NO*** Petitioner who would have status and standing to challenge such violations of the court’s ***mandatory*** ***original*** jurisdiction (see e.g. ***Ashwander v TVA 297 US 288,341***).

In support of this claim, a daunting amount of relevant, admissible, documentary evidence WILL be presented to a common law Jury in any ensuing action on this, and a LOT of other violations of Rights secured by the CuS.

And the big deal in the Texas case is that the mainstream media were just off by ***FIVE*** words (cases in which a ***State***…” since State does ***NOT*** mean State, but I can’t believe that the Justices would make this mistake, especially in view of the history of the ***RAT***ification of ***NEFWA***.

“Mistakes” were made by ***ALL*** ‘official’ actors in the instant case as they were/should have been confronted with ***800*** (!) pages of ***UNOPPOSED*** challenges to the jurisdiction of the trial ‘court’, with such actors having ***at least*** the ***SWORN*** duty to be ***BOUND*** by “***this Constitution*** and the laws ***enacted in pursuance thereof***” (***Article VI, Sec. 2***), to sustain ***at least*** the government’s burden of proof on ***jurisdiction and venue of the trial ‘court***’., notwithstanding the ***FACT*** that these documents are in accord with, indeed amplified by, the opinion in ***Texas v California***. Do we really have to say “***Olmstead***” here ??

As the record will enlighteningly establish, this ***never*** occurred, most ***conspicuously*** with (what would have been) the ***ABSENCE*** of any reply to the ***Demand for a Bill of Particulars***, which made it ***IMPOSSIBLE*** for Petitioner to put on ***ANY*** defense, let alone a ***meaningful*** and ***substantive*** defense ***mandated*** by the ***CuS***, as set forth, infra, and this in ***any and ALL*** settings in a trial ‘court’ – “***criminal”, family law, MORTgage foreclosure, IRS***, etc..

And for a variety of reasons, which include the present and ongoing Democrat court-packing plan, with the possibility of the current ***occupant*** of the White House /aka/ Biden adding as many Justices to the Court as he would like, perhaps ‘courtesy’ of an Executive Order acting as ***Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces***, apparently having learned nothing from like, albeit equally ***ILL begotten*** efforts of ***FDR*** in an earlier era, and this a ***dead-bang giveaway*** as to the true jurisdiction of the trial ‘court’ in the instant case, this long overdue train of thought on the court which is not now limited to 2 or 3 Jjustices, about which a ***LOT*** more can and will be said in any ensuing action, ***IF*** one is necessary.

Noted here is that ***NONE*** of the following claims has anything to do with civil “rights” and/or reliance on the ***NEFWA***, thus there are ***NOT*** any ***affirmative*** defenses and/or qualified, let alone absolute, “***judicial***” immunity to be considered here ***AND*** that there are no ‘remedies to be exhausted’, since Mr. Sixpack, as are all like situated victims of the “***Ju$t u$ $y$tem***”, are entitled to be in a State Court of common law general jurisdiction exercising the ***judicial*** power of the State of California, a State admitted into “***this Union***” as a common law State***1*** and/or the concurrent ***judicial*** power of the united States, this from day ***ONE*** of the proceedings against them.

Indeed, this matter alone settles the issue, since the ***CuS*** mandates the existence of ***judicial*** Courts, one way or another, since ***NO*** judicial Courts = ***NO*** judicial process = ***NO Right*** to trial by Jury = ***ALL*** allegedly applicable laws are ***NULL*** and ***VOID*** ***nunc pro tunc ab initio*** as ***Bills of Attainder***.

And ***ALL*** of these violations of ***Rights*** will have a ***rebuttable***, if not ***conclusive***, evidentiary presumption in ***OUR*** favor, in any ensuing action, due to the failure of those in ‘official’ positions of “***honor***, profit and ***trust***” in the ***de facto*** government, to even attempt to sustain the government’s burden of proof on ***at least*** the jurisdiction and venue of the trial ‘court’, which is not only ***IMPOSSIBLE***, but would establish, and ***ON THE RECORD***, the absence of jurisdiction if the trial ‘court’ and the ***PERSONAL*** liability of ***ALL*** ‘official’ actors in positions of “***honor***, profit and ***trust***” in the de facto government,, up to, and potentially including the ***territorial*** Governor, who has the ***SWORN*** duty to “see that the laws are ***FAITHFULLY*** executed”.

A brief review of violations, ***NOT*** a complete list, includes what the record ***WILL*** establish the all but certainty of the suspension of Petitioner’s ***UNOPPOSED*** ***NON***-statutory ***federal***Writ of Habeas Corpus by a ***purportedly neutral magistrate*** (***Tumey v Ohio 273 US 510***) magistrate, ***IF*** Petitioner had had any way to ***KNOW*** about this ***Right***, a ***clear and unambiguous*** violation of ***at least Article I, Section 9, Clause 2***, with ***no known*** ***DECLARED*** state of ***rebellion*** or ***invasion*** being in existence (***Covid ‘Plandemic’*** ***NOT*** relevant here at all);

Denial of trial by Jury according to the course of the common law, which ***WOULD*** have occurred if not for a dismissal or plea deal, which was entered into ***under duress and coercion***, and which could ***NOT*** be construed as a “***voluntary, knowing and intelligent***” waiver of ***ANY Rights*** secured by the ***CuS*** (see e.g. ***Johnson v Zerbst 304 US 458***);

Well worthy of note here is that this ***Right*** , the ***key*** to all other ***Rights***, is secured to “***inhabitants of territories***” by ***Article II of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787***, as reenacted by the first Congress, yet ***NOWHERE*** in sight in your STATE, ***purportedly*** admitted, like California, into “***this Union***” on September 9th, 1850 as a common law State (see e.g. “***Report on the Civil and Common Law***” ***1 Cal. Rpts. 588*** et seq.);

An ***egregiously evil*** denial of ***effective*** assistance of counsel, a ***Right NOT*** emanating from any provision of ***NEFWA***; indeed the record will establish, ***IF*** necessary, the ***absolute absence*** of anything ***remotely resembling*** ***effective*** assistance of counsel;

And this is a ***NO*** brainer, since ***ALL*** of the ***UNOPPOSED*** Constitutional issues attempted to be presented ***directly*** challenge any and ***ALL*** members of the ‘state’ ***BAR ASS***ociation (***sBA***) /aka/ ***unregistered foreign agents*** who have ***NOT*** been appointed by the President, as ***REQUIRED*** in ***territories*** pursuant to the ‘appointments clause’, ***Article II, Section 2***, with ***ALL sBA*** members having ***multiple irreconcilable conflicts of interests*** with ***Rights*** secured by ***ALL 6 Articles of the CuS***, most especially as related to the ***malevolent, malignant monopoly*** on the “practice of law” currently enjoyed by ***sBA*** members;

Also duly noted is that ***ALL*** ‘judges’ in what ***fraudulently*** purport to be State Courts of common law general jurisdiction, are ***REQUIRED*** to be ***sBA*** members, a ***FATAL*** blow to the ***Republican*** form of government guaranteed to the States by ***at least Article IV, Section 4*** (***NOT*** (!) a “political” question), yet, at one and the same time are also ***required*** to be ***neutral*** magistrates by the ***CuS*** according to the US supreme Court (***Tumey, supra***; ***YES***, this is a ***NEFWA*** decision, but that said, what ***NEFWA “birthright shitizens***” ***might*** have as a ***corporate privilege***, ***at least*** lawful, de jure, ***jus sanguinis*** State Citizens, if not “***inhabitants of territories***”, have as a ***Right*** ) !

This situation alone ***should*** have resulted in the ***sua sponte*** recusal of ***ALL sBA*** member ‘judges’ in the instant case, yet the ***EXACT*** opposite occurred, the net result being ***summary, ex parte 12(b)(6) ‘denials’*** of ***ALL*** of claimant’s ***UNOPPOSED*** ***Constitutional, structural, jurisdictional*** issues, this by ‘official’ actors in positions of “***honor***, profit and ***trust***” in the ***de facto*** government, yet ones with ***irreconcilable conflicts of interest*** with ***Rights*** secured by ***ALL 6 Articles of the CuS*** as hereinabove set forth;

That California is ***NOT*** a State admitted into “***this Union***”, with ***relevant, admissible documentary and testamentary*** establishing this ***seemingly*** astounding ***FACT***, including another ***summary, ex parte 12(b)(6) “denial”*** of Counsel’s Petition for a ***NON***-statutory ***federal*** Writ of Habeas Corpus (***Exhibit B***), ‘courtesy’ of a ***DEPUTY ~~jerk~~ clerk*** (?!?) of the California supreme court, yet another a ***clear and unambiguous*** violation of ***at least Article I, Sec. 9, Cl.2*** and/or the ***9th Amendment***, conceding the correctness of the ***UNOPPOSED 83*** (!) page ***Brief on Admission of New States FILED*** in the instant case. Had the “Justices” done this, they would now be in ***close proximity to San Quentin Cell 2455***.

That there is ***NO NEFWA***, the ***RAT***ification of which involved a ***gargantuan, grisly gruesome, ‘grand slam’*** of violations of ***Rights*** secured by ***ALL 6 Articles of the CuS*** and that the record, in any ensuing action, will PROVE that ***NEFWA*** was effectively, not to mention ***contemporaneously***, ruled unconstitutional by the US supreme court;

That any and all ***allegedly applicable*** statutory schemes are likewise unconstitutional and, for a variety of reasons having the ***same evidentiary presumptions***, most particularly the ***FACT*** that ***NO*** judicial Courts = ***NO*** judicial process = all such laws being ***NULL and VOID nunc pro tunc ab initio***, as any ‘***neutral***’, law school graduate magistrate should know, ***Bills of Attainder*** /aka/ ***Writs of Praecipe***, the taking of life, liberty or property ***WITHOUT*** judicial process, ***plain*** violations of ***Article I, Section 9 or 10***, as the case may be of, and/or the ***9th Article of Amendment*** to, the ***CuS***, with the last known ***serious*** ruling on this issue by the supreme Court being ***Cummings v Missouri 4 Wall. 277 in 1867*** .

Another ***irrefutable*** violation of ***Rights*** occurred when the ‘***perps***’ did ***NOT*** permit ***Petitioner*** to invoke his ***Right*** to trial by Jury according to the course of the common law, with ***NO*** opportunity to present ***his theory of the case*** and ***572*** (!) Jury Instructions to a Jury, with the power to rule on the facts ***AND THE LAW (Georgia v Brailsford 2 Dall. 402***), possibly even preventing the presentation of ***relevant, admissible documentary and testamentary*** evidence by Counsel, as an ***expert witness***, what with ***5 decades*** of ***intense, passionate*** and ***independent*** study of the Constitution, knowing that they were powerless to prevent me, and others with ***personal*** knowledge of the events, from giving further ***relevant, admissible*** testimony.

Also noted here is that the ***572*** Instructions are necessitated to educate members of a Jury /aka/ ***like situated victims*** of the “***Ju$t u$ $y$tem” (Ju$)*** and the ***mandatory*** public “education” system, not to mention most law schools, in which there are ***NOT*** any ***meaningful*** and ***substantive*** ***curricula*** for the study of the Constitution, history and laws of the united States, thus the Jurors would have ***NO*** way to know that they had, and have, the power to rule on the facts ***and the law***, and sure as hell would ***NOT*** be instructed by any ***sBA*** member ‘judge’ who, like ***ALL*** members of the ***sBA***, has ***irreconcilable conflicts of interest*** with ***Rights secured by the CuS***, ***at least*** to the extent that they conflict with the ***malignant, malevolent monopoly*** of the ***sBA*** on the “practice of law”.

Taking it further here, there could ***NOT*** have been a lawful trial by Jury in any event, sine the Juror Pools are exclusively formed from ‘motor-voter’ lists, at least in the ***territory*** of CALIFORNIA, ***ALL*** of which members are drawn from those claiming, whether ***knowingly or not***, the “birthright ***shitizenship***” emanating from ***NEFWA***, which ***TOTALLY*** excludes ***ALL*** members of the sovereign body politic of the State of California, not to mention the united States, who are ‘conveniently’ ***NOT*** recognized by, or represented in, ***ANY*** department of the ***de facto*** California government, perhaps the clearest proof possible of ***at least*** the ***FACT*** that there is ***NO republican*** form of government in CALIFORNIA, or anywhere else, for that matter, which is guaranteed by ***at least Article IV, Section 4*** of the ***CuS,*** which is ***NOT*** (!) a “***political question***”, supra (see, ***seemingly*** contra, but ***easily*** distinguishable, ***Luther v Borden 7 Howard 1***, the ***only*** known decision of the US supreme Court on this subject).

Perhaps the instant case might ‘fill in a few gaps’ here.

And we haven’t even gotten to the ‘money’ issue yet, what with ***UNDEFINED*** (??!) dollars, the Fed claiming, ***on the record***, to have the power to ***create money out of DEBT*** (!) and the ensuing ***cesspools*** of streams of debt being distributed, in whole or in part, which ***reverberate*** throughout ***at least*** the criminal “***Ju$***”, the close link to ***federal regional martial law rule*** which comes along ‘for the ride’, and the ringing indictment of ***fully complicit*** ‘state’ ***BAR ASS***ociations, which does away with any ‘convenient’ ***fictions of law*** pursuant to the ***perceived*** ‘right’ to counsel as it emanates from any provisions of ***NEFWA***.

Nor have we visited the situation with regard to any “elections”, noting that in the recent “election” that Trump would have been better served to have challenged the result on other grounds, such as ***CON***gress is ***NOT*** authorized to provide for elections in, for all apparent intents and purposes, ***federal (insular ?) territorial possessions***, for the office of President, Senator, or ***VOTING*** members of the House, ***NONE*** of whom are lawfully in office in any event, as the record in any ensuing proceedings will further illustrate and establish.

Indeed, the ***RAT***ification of ***NEFWA*** has had the ***planned***, albeit ***carefully concealed***, effect, of destroying States admitted into “***this Union***”, notably ***NORTH*** of the ***Mason-Dixon Line*** as well, with the result that the ‘residence’ of all “***PERSONS***” /aka/ ***artificial, corporate entities***, born in (the Trust known as) the United States and ***SUBJECT*** (?!?) to the jurisdiction thereof, can, ‘conveniently’, be found, for all jurisdictional purposes, in the ***District of Columbia*** and thus subject to ***Article I, Section 8, Cl. 17***, if not ***Article IV, Section 3*** – see e.g. ***26 USC 7408(d)***.

Coming to the complaint against ***Mr. Sixpack***, the listed ‘Plaintiff’ is “The People of the your State”, which is ***impossible*** since ***your State*** does ***NOT*** exist and, even if it did, “the People of the ***your State***” is an ***UNDEFINED*** entity in the ***bastardized*** version of ***your State*** Constitution ***allegedly*** currently in effect.

Duly noted here, for example, is that “The People of the State of California” ***ARE*** defined in ***Article II, Section 1 of the California Constitution (1849)***, which remains in full force and effect, as being “***free, white males 21 years or older***”, corollary authorities being ***Scott v Sandford 19 Howard 393 and Van Valkenburg v Brown 43 Cal 43***, the latter decided ***conspicuously after*** the ***RAT***ification of ***NEFWA***.

As an exemplar, what authority as exists for issuing process in the name of “The People of the State of California” ***is*** found in ***Article VI, Section 18 of the Constitution of 1849***, which further attests to its continued vitality, noting, alas, that “The People of the State of California” are no longer recognized by, or represented in, the de facto California government, an ***essential*** element in establishing the “***CONSENT of the governed***” which has been ***conspicuously ABSENT*** in the instant proceedings from day ***ONE***.

That said, the only possible plaintiff in the instant case would be “***Your State”*** , which the record also ***proves*** does ***NOT*** exist and, ***IF*** it did, ***Article III, Section 2 of the CuS*** provides that “in ***ALL*** cases in which a State is a party, the supreme Court shall have ***ORIGINAL*** jurisdiction”, meaning that the proceedings would only have been lawful in ***WAR***shington, DC, ***NOT*** in ***your State***, notwithstanding ***Texas v California***, supra.

Research also discloses that virtually all ‘crimes’ these days are commercial offenses (***27 CFR 72.11***) and thus evidently cognizable pursuant to the interstate commerce powers of ***CON***gress, with the supreme Court having ruled that: “the interstate commerce clause powers are ***closely*** associated with the ***admiralty*** jurisdiction” (***NJ Steam v Merchants Bank 6 Howard 344***). ***NLRB*** et al

Not only were the Framers of the Constitution ***acutely*** aware of ***admiralty***, a “jurisdiction ***foreign*** to our Constitution and ***unacknowledged*** by our laws”, the ***central*** cause of the American Revolution, they made sure that State courts were Constitutionally ***BARRED***, pursuant to ***Article III, Section 2*** from exercising it – see also ***Section 9 of the Judiciary Act of 1789, 1 Statutes at Large 73*** et seq.

Well worthy of note are the following ‘features’ to which victims of the “***Ju$***” are subjected, as in the instant case, ***ALL*** of which are ***clear*** and ***unambiguous*** violations of ***Rights*** secured by the ***CuS***, yet entirely ‘consistent’, for all apparent intents and purposes, with the ‘due process of law’ emanating from ***NEFWA***:

That ***NONE*** of Mr. Sixpack’s ‘timely’ filed challenges to jurisdiction were even acknowledged by ***ANY*** of the ‘official’ actors involved, most especially the ***Demand for a Bill of Particulars***.

This situation, ‘conveniently’, for the ***Ju$***, denies the victim the ***uncontested Right*** to know the ***nature & cause of the accusations*** /aka/ the jurisdiction and venue of the trial ‘court’ and the rules of the ***allegedly*** applicable ***CON*** game, ***NO*** way to know the definitions of the ‘crimes’ ***allegedly*** committed or what must be proven to gain a conviction and, ***MOST*** importantly, the identity of the ***INJURED*** party, without which it is ***IMPOSSIBLE*** to invoke the equally ***uncontested Right*** of ***Confrontation and Cross-examination***.

The upshot here is that the victim is left with ***NO*** way to put on ***ANY*** defense, let alone a ***meaningful*** and ***substantive*** defense contemplated by the ***CuS***, this before a common law Jury with the power to rule on the facts ***and the law,***  ***Brailsford, supra***, which ***inevitably*** leads to a conviction in a “fair trial” /aka/ to the Constitution as a ***Directed Verdict of Guilt*** (see e.g. ***Bass v US 784 Fed. 2nd 1282***).

All of this is ***exacerbated*** by the fact that there is ***NO*** right to ***effective*** assistance of ***knowledgeable*** counsel who would present the issues arising in the instant case, with ***Darryl Stallworth*** being a ‘stellar’ example’ from another case (see attached ***Exhibit A***, my ***Affidavit of our meeting***) in the instant case of either ***insidious ignorance*** and/or ***collusive corruption***, to the point that only ***Johannes Mehserle***, ***Martha Stewart*** or ***Felicity Huffman*** types get ***privileged*** help which results in minimum sentences in ‘***Club Fed***’, not to mention fat, ***unreported*** payoffs to all involved ‘official’ actors.

Next in line here of effectively ***NON***-existent defense (??) attorney ***David Bryden*** who, after a briefly promising start, took ***NO*** action to present ***ANY*** of the multiple ***UNOPPOSED structural, jurisdictional*** issues that the victim wished to present (see ***Exhibit B***, my responsive letter to ***Bryden***)

As if this isn’t bad enough, the victim then learns that the US supreme Court has ***RULED*** that there is ***NO*** right to an appeal in ***ANY*** ‘criminal’ case (***McKane v Durston 153 US 684***), that ***law enforcement thugs***, often the only ‘witnesses’ testifying against the victim, have virtually ***absolute immunity*** for ***ALL perjured*** testimony (***Briscoe v LaHue 460 US 352***), that the ***purportedly neutral*** magistrates have ***qualified***, if not ***ABSOLUTE***, ‘judicial’ immunity for any and all errors or omissions committed (***Imbler v Pachtman 464 US 209; Stump v Sparkman 435 US 349***), a ***hell*** of a feat of ***legislative legerdemain***, emanating from what has been established in the instant case as being a ***territorial tribunal***.

And then the victim discovers that ***ACTUAL*** (!) innocence is ***NOT*** grounds for the issuance of a ***fatuous*** statutory Writ of Habeas Corpus (***Coleman v Thompson 501 US 722; McCleskey v Zant 499 US 286***), with the ‘courts’, especially the US supreme court, having ***seemingly*** great concern for the independence and integrity of the several States and their ‘duly promulgated’ laws and forms, this notwithstanding the ***FACT*** that the Justices must be aware of ***ALL*** of the issues set forth herein, particularly that there are ***NO*** States remaining which ***were*** admitted into “***this Union***” !

It gets worse, when the victim finds out that the common law remedy in the US supreme Court, the ***Writ of Error***, has been ‘repealed’ by the ***allegedly*** applicable Judiciary Act of 1928, albeit this by the 69th ***CON***gress which, very arguably, had ***ZERO*** qualified members in either House, let alone a ***Quorum to do business***, assuming arguendo that it could have enacted this legislation at all.

The same for the common law ***Writ of Quo Warranto*** which, ***IF*** it remains in existence at all, is under the ***TOTAL*** control of a ***territorial*** Attorney General, yet another ***sBA*** ‘official’ actor, and one who has ***NOT*** been appointed by the President, as ***required*** in a territory.

And there is ***NO*** relief forthcoming, as planned, from what purport to be State Constitutions, since appellate judges are virtually ordered to rule that all errors or omissions by a trial ‘judge’ were “***harmless***” errors (see e.g.***Article VI, Section 13*** of the ***bastardized*** version of the California Constitution ***allegedly*** currently in effect), including defense (??) counsel ***SLEEPING*** though large parts of a ***capital*** case in which the ***DEATH*** penalty was imposed (***Burdine v Johnson 231 Fed. 3rd 950***) and/or counsel filing a statutory writ of Habeas Corpus ***2 days “too late***” and the victim being ***EXECUTED*** (***Coleman***, supra).

In closing, please take ***close*** notice of the ***FACTS*** that in at least CALIFORNIA, ***NOT*** (!) a “***foreign*** jurisdiction”, the CALIFORNIA supreme court has stated, in ***documentary*** form no less than ***TEN*** (!) times, that CALIFORNIA is ***NOT*** a State admitted into “***this Union***”, ***ALL*** of which will either be ***relevant, admissible evidence*** sustaining our burden of proof on any and ***ALL*** claims of violations of ***Rights*** secured by the Constitution ***OR***, in the alternative, ***IF*** ‘denied’ an equally strong admission that there are NO States and/or that there is ***NO*** Constitution.

The painfully obvious result here is that ***IF*** somehow Mr. ***Sixpack***, not to mention ***all like situated victims of the Ju$***, is wrong, he has ***NO*** way to know ***WHY*** and ***CANNOT*** invoke the ***Right*** to instruct ***his*** (??) representatives, does ***NOT*** have any way to nominate and elect those who ***will*** make the desired changes and simply ***CANNOT*** make any “***voluntary, knowing and intelligent***” use of the right to vote, assuming arguendo that ***CON***gress has any authority to provide for elections as set forth, supra, ***AND*** that he somehow ***magically regains “competence”*** on “Election Day”.

Hopefully the situation is coming into sharp focus here in that an ***inflamed*** Jury will be very probably left to wonder how it is that ‘***Joe Sixpack***’ ***IS*** aware of all of the violations of ***Rights***, supra, and ‘official’ actors, law school graduates all, ***BOUND*** by Oath by “***this Constitution*** and the laws enacted ***in pursuance thereof***” are ***seemingly*** ‘***blissfully ignorant***’ of their ***SWORN*** duties.

Accordingly, we all know ***EXACTLY*** what the record is going to show here, thus this is an opportunity for you to act in ***good*** (!) faith for once and make a settlement offer ***commensurate with the magnitude*** of the violations of ***Rights secured by the CuS*** set forth supra (***NOT*** (!) a complete list), not to mention ***punitive*** and ***exemplary*** damages amounts as might well be assessed by a Jury and make this claim go quickly and quietly away, with little, if any, publicity for what looks a ***LOT*** like career ending criminal acts, while also rewarding our forbearance in seeking to present any of the multiple acts of ***Treason*** which have occurred (***Cohens, supra***) likely on ***multiple*** occasions, by ***multiple*** ‘official’ actors, and perhaps in front of ***multiple*** witnesses, to a ***federal criminal Grand Jury***.

Your ***PROMPT*** attention to this matter will be expected within 30 days.

Constitutionally,

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

William Henshall